DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 106 391 UD 015 119

AUTHOR Cole, Michael; Hall, William S.
TITLE The Cultural Context of Education: [and Seminar Discussion].
PUB DATE 17 May 74
NOTE 67p.; Paper presented at the Seminar on Public Policy (Center for Urban Studies, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, May 17, 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Acculturation; Basic Skills; *Cultural Factors; Economic Opportunities; Educational Needs; *Educational Problems; *Minority Group Children; Performance Factors; Policy Formation; Public Policy; *Research Problems; *School Role; Student School Relationship; Teaching Styles

ABSTRACT

In their presentation, at the start of the seminar, the authors note that their focus is on the relationship between cultural needs and the operation of the educational enterprise, and some potential contributions of psychological research to the formulation of educational and social policy. Their case rests on three arguments: (1) schooling has been traditionally viewed as the door of access to full participation in the culture. This has not been true for some members of the culture, particularly non-white minorities; i.e. certain socio-cultural factors make it difficult for them to get through the door, Moreover, these "sub-cultural" factors are at variance with the demands of the mainstream school; (2) schooling is not the door through which one must pass if one is to have access to mainstream American life. The explicitly stated role of the school is not the real one; and, (3) this argument focuses on what the various roles of education are and how they affect minorities. The presentation ends with a discussion of some of the authors' research which (1) questions the idea that basic abilities for example, attention, abstraction, etc. are non-transferable; and (2) demonstrates that performance changes are domain specific. (Author/JM)

ED106391

The Cultural Context of Education

Michael Cole and William S.Hall[1]
The Rockefeller University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Introduction

A topic like "the cultural context of education" is a kind of engraved invitation to repeat a bunch of old saws and to enter into the general debate on culture, intelligence and education with God on our side. In fact, we have had some difficulty in deciding how to comment on this giant domain of social concern in a manner which might be even tangentially useful to persons concerned with social policy, and we would like to avoid the snares that we see our colleagues blundering into-sometimes voluntarily, sometimes against their wills.

Consequently, we have hit upon the idea of giving an "anti-psychologist-as-policy-maker" talk in which we will attempt to set psychological research related to cultural variations in education and educational performance in a larger social framework and relegate psychological research relating cognition and educational performance to a secondary role. Specifically, the focus of today's presentation will be the relationship between cultural needs and the operation of the educational enterprise in America, and some potential contributions of psychological research to the formation of educational and social policy.

Essentially our case rests on three arguments. These arguments and an explication of them are as follows:

---

[1] Paper presented as Lecture V, Series on Public Policy, Center for Urban Studies, Harvard University, May 17, 1974.

UD015119

Argument #1: Schooling has been traditionally viewed as the door of access to full participation in the culture. While this has been true for many members of the culture, it has not been so for some others, particularly non-white minorities; i.e. certain socio-cultural factors make it difficult for them to get through the door. Moreover, these "sub-cultural" factors are at variance with the demands of the mainstream school to such a degree that they create a mismatch between the school and the learner. School officials believe that if psychologists and other relevant behavioral scientists could specify the nature of the mismatch, changes in education could be made and many of our educational problems would be solved.

Argument #2: The second argument maintains just the reverse of argument #1 - namely, that schooling is not the door through which one must pass if one is to have access to mainstream American life. The argument here is that the explicitly stated role of the school is not the real one (for example, equality, democracy, job opportunities, etc.). Indeed, the economic demands of society require inequality. Making all learners successful in school flies in the face of the aformentioned demands.

Argument #3: The argument here focuses on what the various roles of education are and how they affect minorities. One of the questions to which we shall attend here is the following: How much of the educational enterprise's effort should go into specific preparation of students for the job market; i.e., what should be the proper role of education in the credentialing process? If the educational enterprise is to be restructured, what would be the role of psychological research in this process? Should the role of psychological research be to lay bare the mechanisms operating in current situations? Or should the role of psychological research be to examine basic concepts at many levels so as to get ideas of how useful modifications would be in the teaching process?

The presentation will end with a discussion of some of our research which (1) questions the idea that basic abilities (for example, attention, abstraction, etc.) are non-transferable; and (2) demonstrates that performance changes are domain specific. In this discussion we shall be careful to note that psychological research such as ours is by itself of limited significance for educational and social policy, and that perhaps its major contribution resides in killing the idea that non-mainstream children are inherently stupid.

Explication of the Arguments

Fifteen or twenty years ago, we would probably have experienced little difficulty in digging into the topic of culture and education in a straightforward manner that linked school success to economic success. Economic success was seen as one consequence of school success. School success was in turn a function of "cognitive skills" which were socialized in the home and modified by the school. The policy goal was clear and there was even a recipe for how to achieve it. Indeed, the goal could be rather forthrightly stated as go to college or high school and economic success will surely follow. The means were equally clear-they held that if education, which compensated for inadequacies in the child's intellectual socialization, were provided the aformentioned goal would be reached.

The fruits of this approach are too familiar to warrant extensive comment by us. The extension of universial education down into the pre-school and up into expanded Community Colleges and open enrollment programs was the obvious policy to follow. This course is having a set of consequences which, with the pan-seeing wisdom of hindsight, also seem obvious, i.e., lack of positive long term effects of school-based head start programs, and high drop-out rates in the open enrollment programs (see for example
And of course we then get the almost inevitable conclusion that "these people" didn't have what it takes in. the first place.

Working within this framework, social scientists have continued to follow the logic of a system which posits the existence of formal schooling as a mechanism for transforming the "outs" into "ins." This logic tells us that if only we can find some way to transform the child, so that he can

benefit from the opportunity which schools offer, or if we can bend the school to "meet the child where he is" we can solve the educational, and thus the social problems of America's minorities and the poor.

This is essentially argument #1. The untenability of this argument can perhaps most appropriately be seen if we juxtapose it with argument #2. To accomplish this we will present some evidence that supports the lack of validity of the first argument, by examining what Greer (1972) has called the "Great School Legend," look at evidence concerning the role of education in various societies around the world, and then return to examine the question of the relation between culturally conditioned cognitive socialization and school performance. We hope that by providing this different framework within which to view education as a social institution, we can suggest a more policy-relevant perspective for considering the role of cognitive socialization in school performance.

If we assume that educational performance is the high road to economic success for broad masses of people, then Greer's attack on this hallowed assumption is succinct and compelling:

> "...My point is not merely that schools worked poorly in earlier times, but that their failure has been, in fact, a criterion of their social success, then and now... The fact of the matter is that American public schools in general, and urban public schools in particular, are a highly successful enterprise. Basic to that success is the high degree of academic failure among students... The schools do the job today that they have always done. They select out individuals for opportunities according to a hierarchical schema which runs closely parallel to existing social class patterns. The problem today is that there is an increasing shortage of even low level employment options for those on the lower levels of the public school totem pole. As a result, the schools now produce people who are a burden upon, rather than the mainstay of the socio-economic order."

We do not have to agree with the details of Greer's analysis to derive two major messages from his thesis: (1) the American educational system is not and never has been a mechanism for bringing about the transformation of the social order-it is the social order which shapes the schools and not the other way around; and(2) although the educational system has operated selectively against all minority groups, the greatest selective weight has fallen on Blacks.

These two general conclusions are vital to any serious policy-making discussion concerning education. The importance of these ideas to economists and political scientists is obvious. But we believe that psychologists and educators themselves ought to take full account of these social realities or continue to run the danger of their best intentions turned against them by forces which are both beyond their control and their understanding. We are inevitably led to a consideration of whether or not education is a transmitting or a transforming agent; thus, we are face to face with argument #2.

A point made repeatedly by anthropologists concerned with education is that education in traditional societies plays quite a different role than we attribute to schools in modern-day America. To select from one of the many discussions on the topic, Redfield (1943) identifies education with "the process of culture transmission and renewal," (p. 640).The major point in all discussions of this type is that education is carried out by adult members of the community and older siblings in the context of everyday

activities that characterize the culture. Education is very much a part of everyday life; so much so that many or most traditional societies have no specialized activities that are set aside as times for teaching and learning. Even in societies where there are specialized learning and teaching activities transmission of the culture is the function of the activities of all involved; the young have a lot to learn to become like their parents.

In modern societies, education has come to have quite a different set of meanings consistent with a new set of functions (according to standard ideology). Many have noted that modern education has moved out of the home and the kinship group, into school rooms and the hands of stranger-specialists (e.g. Herzog). In our own work we have posited that the move into the schoolroom has not only ideological, but also cognitive consequences (Cole and Scribner, 1973). Most importantly for the present discussion, the relocation of education into classrooms has had the effect that the function of education often ceases to be the transmission of culture and becomes instead the transformation of culture. This may not always be the case. For example, Koranic schools which confine themselves to religious education may indeed play a role that is predominantly transmitting. But there can be little doubt that in modern industrial societies, schools are predominantly seen as institutions for transforming children, rather than transmitting to them the knowledge that will make them adults like their parents.

We think this distinction between institutions that transmit culture and institutions that intend to transform children, is critical to understanding the culture-cognition-education nexus, because the degree to which modern schooling involves either transmission or transformation is tightly bound up with the cultural and socio-economic origins ofthe child being educated.

Further, we think that it is reasonable to argue that modern schools, like their counterparts in traditional societies, are doing a pretty good job of transmitting culture to those for whom the process of education is, predominantly, a process of transmission. It is the process of transforming children that eludes our public education system. Greer's "Great School Legend" long kept us from a recognition of this dual role and dual outcome of modern education. To quote Greer again,

> "...our naivete about what school "success" really meant in the past has made it difficult to appreciate the uniqueness of the current demand that public schools make a positive difference in academic performance of poor children-black or white...the fact remains that the public education system we have inherited has no precedent whatsoever in its past upon which to draw in order to meet that demand (our italics)(p.151).

Note that Greer does not claim that schools must make a positive difference for everyone- just for the poor. The reason for this selectivity is an obvious fact of social life. There is little reason to change middle-class anglo children; they are simply expected to learn to be the same kind of grownups as their parents. The school transmits their parents' culture and it does this as well as it transmits culture in other countries. But modern American schools do not transmit culture to ethnic minorities and the poor- they seek to transform the culture of these children-consequently a mismatch is created between the "parent culture" and the "dominant" one.

A number of features of education in our urban ghettos and rural schools in minority-dominated areas can be seen to be consistent with this transmission-transformation dichotomy. In traditional societies the adults who do the educating are either parents, or surrogates for the parents, who share the

important features of the culture with eachother. This is also true for the children of America's middle-class and professional parents. The teachers are, in important respects, their surrogates. But who is the surrogate for the A.D.C. mother or the Navajo shepherd?

The anthropological distinction between education as transmission or transformation of culture corresponds rather neatly to a concept long popular with psychologists: the concept of a match or mismatch between the cognitive and motivational demands of the child's environment and the intellectual apparatus which he brings to any problem.

The match-mismatch distinction arises in many different psychological contexts. Within a Piagetian framework, a discrepancy between the schema available to a child and the schema required by the problem he confronts is thought by many to be the engine of cognitive development. In popular discussions, common sense ideas about minority children comming to school unprepared to meet rigid time schedules, rules of decorum, and lacking specific knowledge presupposed by teachers, is another version of this set of ideas. Finally, a great deal of attention has been devoted to discussions of language differences between home and school. We shall review briefly some studies which illustrate approaches for dealing with a variety of perceived mismatches, thereby articulating a feasible role for the psychologist in social policy formation.

But before beginning such a summary, we would like to reiterate a distinction implied in our initial remarks. If our analysis of the role of education in society is correct, and especially if we believe that a major

function of education in America is to allocate people to different segments of the economy, it would be absurd for us to view a manipulation of the match between home culture and school culture a means of solving all the social problems attendant on massive school failure. As research psychologists, we can and do view the heterogeneity of human sub-cultures as a natural laboratory for the study of human cognitive development. We hope to demonstrate that properly designed research shows that children can be and often are transformed by school experiences. We can also find illustrations of specific mismatches on children's performance. But we do not view such work as a high road to solving the educational problems of minorities and the poor: such solutions rest upon broadly based social reforms, not individual achievments.

With this caveat in mind we can turn to some examples of psychological research aimed at specifying child-task mismatches that pose problems for educators and educational psychologists.

Delineation of the match-mismatch problem: a feasible role for the psychological researchers in the formation of social policy.

Language

To begin, suppose we look at language. Williams and Rivers (1972) have investigated this problem as it applies to Blacks in a testing situation. Briefly their starting point can be stated as follows:

> (1) Standardized tests (predictor variables) as presently composed are biased in favor of those children whose basic language is standard English. (2) Educational Programs (criterion variables) are biased against non-speakers of standard English.
> (3) The structural similarity and content of items in educational programs and ability tests are near isomorphic. It appears that if both predictor and criterion are biased, and is there is a high correlation between predictor and criterion, then all previous

> correlational studies involving the prediction of the Black child's performance on standardized tests and his performance in traditional American classrooms must be seriously challenged. This situation in which the predictor and the criterion are highly correlated but show little or negative relationship to the background of the child, is termed the problem of the mis-matched by Williams. They hypothesized that given a fair predictor (Boehm Test under non-standard instruction) a Black child would perform significantly better than under conditions of an unfair predictor (Boehm under standard instruction).

To test their assumptions, Williams and Rivers carried out three studies. In the first of these, 990 Black kindergarten, first and second grade children from 48 classrooms in the St. Louis public school system served as subjects for this study. Variables of race, I.Q., age, sex and grade level were controlled for in both experimental and control group.

Standard and non-standard versions of the Boehm Test of Basic Concepts (BTBC) were used in the study. The BTBC consists of 50 pictoral multiple choice items involving concepts of space, quantity and time. Black teachers and students were used to translate the concepts and objects into the Black idiom.

In the second study, three classrooms (kg.,1,2) containing a total of 59 children from the St. Louis public school system were selected for study. All the subjects were from families which would be classified by the Hollinshed and Redlich (1958) scales as belonging to the lower socio-economic level. None of these subjects were participants in study I and all the children in this study were from a Black community.

Each class was administered both the standard and the non-standard versions of the BTBC under the same instructional format as described in study I. In each classroom, one half of the children received the standard version first, and the non-standard version second. The remaining half of the children received the reverse order of presentation.

The third study involved a comparison of the performance scores from the subjects used in study 2 with Boehm's normative data. Williams and Rivers found the following:

(1) Significant differences ($t > .01$) between the mean performance scores of those children who were administered the standard version of the BTBC and those who were administered the non-standard version of the test developed by the authors. Children given the non-standard (dialect-fair) version, scored significantly higher than those receiving the standard version.

(2) Those children who were administered both standard and non-standard versions scored significantly higher ($t > .01$) on the non-standard version.

(3) It was found that mean differences between the normative data reported by Boehm and the results of the presentation of the standard version of the test to children in the present study were not significantly different. However, the mean scores obtained from the performance of the subjects in the present study on the non-standard version were significantly higher (t .01) than those reported by Boehm for the low SES in her sample. The major finding was that scores from the non-standard administration were very similar, and in many cases, higher than the scores reported by Boehm for subjects in the middle and upper income groups.

The match-mismatch problem in the domain of language has been noted by two other investigators whose work should be mentioned. Lein (1973), for example, examined the settings in which migrant children must communicate at home and at school, the speech patterns considered appropriate in each, and

the response of the child to each setting. Briefly,she observed that in school speech skills are a means to improve status in the eyes of the teacher; whereas in the migrant community, speech appropriateness is in large part determined by the kinship role of the participants, and status in not closely tied to verbal ability. Moreover, the speech of migrant children in their homes is more symetrical than in school-and there is more alternation. Neither of these can be said to occur with any regularity in the schools which these children attend. Some replication of Lein's major findings can be seen in the work of Ward (1971), in Louisiana.

Motivation

While there is abundant confusion in social scientists' attempts to understand cognitive and linguistic differences associated with ethnic and social class origins, there is even greater confusion when it comes to the loosely-connected set of notions surrounding the concept of motivation. When we say that the schools are irrelevant to ghetto children, when we ask, "Why should Johnny give a damn?" we are making assertions about the non-correspondence between the things that interest Johnny, the things he is "motivated" to learn, and the motives inherent in formal schooling.

Very often when we read the accounts of master teachers, we come away with the feeling that the key to success is in motivating children to learn by reducing the gap between school and home cultures; by bringing the rewards of the home culture into the school. But even brief consideration of the examples of successful teachers can assure us that we need to know much more

about what we mean by the term "motivate". We also quickly realize that the techniques to interest children, which motivate them, also deal with information that we have previously linked to conceptual-cognitive differences. In short, it is often difficult to maintain a rigid distinction between cognitive and motivational influences. And even in those cases where a distinction can be made (in especially designed experiments and observations), the concept of motivation which emerges cannot be fit into a simple mould of "give them M & M's."

A failure to appreciate the complexity of motivating children and of the close link between motives and the nature of the activity, characterizes a good deal of the psychological research on cultural variations and the school-home mismatch.

Zigler (1968), who pioneered research into complex social motives as they relate to group differences, long ago listed the following sources of motivational differences between children of different socio-economic classes. Such children are: (1) more wary of adults; (2) more motivated toward securing adult attention and praise; (3) less motivated to be correct for the sake of correctness alone; (4) willing to settle for lower levels of achievment . In a long series of studies, Zigler (1968) demonstrated that these factors operate in complex ways within learning situations to produce varying patterns of performance among children of different ethnic origins, socio-economic status, histories of institutionalization and sex.

Without subscribing to Zigler's particular theory of the relation between motivation and cognitive ability in test performance, we can certainly gain a healthy respect for the complexities of assessing the role of motivation

in the performances of different groups of children.

This respect in turn makes us very dissatisfied with overly simplified approaches to studying motivational factors relating to school performance among minorities and the poor. For example, a recent study by Quay (1972), demonstrated that three and four year old Philadelphia Headstart children did not improve their performance on the Stanford-Binet test when given candy rewards for correct answers. Although Quay notes that the prior experience of the children may have led them to please the friendly Black tester, and although the scores of all the children were in the normal I.Q.range (about 96), the summary tells us that the results "raised questions concerning the existence of motivational...differences in young Negro children who are provided experiences designed to bring them into the mainstream culture."

It is our feeling that such research reports are grossly misleading, not because the findings are of doubtful reliability, but because we have no idea of how and to whom they may be generalized. Would the same conclusions hold for children who test initially in the 80-85 I.Q. range that is often reported for ghetto children? Is a concrete reward really likely to enhance performance over and above strong social rewards? In fact, the tendancy to view Black and poor children as M & M crazed seems to as to miss the message of motivational match and mismatch. We prefer to approach the problem of group differences in motivation in the same way that we approach other aspects of group differences in cognitive performance: to investigate how the activity in question fits the normal activities of the people involved. Motives tacked

on to an arbitrary and alien task will rarely, in the fashion of Spence's rats, multiply habit strength to produce better performance.

As a small example of a "motivational" manipulation in the spirit we are suggesting, we can describe some pilot work by Cole (personal communication), who has been trying to asses the role of game-like contexts on children's learning performance. The experimental situation is a simple one, except that it involves three children instead of one. The children play roles in a game called "Zookeeper." In the game form of this task, two children put on hand puppets of a dog and a bird. There are 8 animal dolls to fill out the zoo. The zookeeper must go to feed the animals. When the animals go to sleep for the night, the zookeeper must call the morning animal feeder to tell him what animals are at the zoo.

This basic proceedure is varied to involve the standard experimental proceedures at certain strategies in the game for some of the children. For example, the standard experimental version would have the child learn a set of pictures of animals in a Stanford-binet type situation. One mixed game-test has the child learning about the animals from picture cards, then being introduced to the zoo where he must know which animals to feed. This work clearly demonstrated that when children are playing a game their recall is better than when a formal learning-testing proceedure is used.

Is this effect motivational or cognitive? We think it is both. Moreover, we can be sure that the influence of the way that the task is presented to the child will vary as a function of all the variables that Zigler and others

have shown to influence children of various ages, sex, groups and so on.

Another accomplishment of this kind of work is to free up our dependence on standardized testing situations to "tap" what the child knows. Such situations "tap" what the child does in the situations studied. What he can do given the right circumstances is quite a different matter.

Conceptual Content

It has very often been claimed, and much less often demonstrated in an educationally relevant manner, that the mismatch in conceptual content between the standard curriculum and the minority/poor child is the source of a great deal of unnecessary educational failure. Informal attempts to deal with this problem are part of the folklore of pedagogy. Master teachers like Sylvia Ashton-Warner, Paolo Friere and Jonathan Kozol have illustrated the superb achievements of children and adults allowed to work from culturally relevant and familiar material on school-like problems. Unfortunately, the style of persons who have worked in this area has been of the case study-illustrative variety. It is very difficult to specify the general principles involved, as Ashton-Warner discovered when she began to apply her ideas in the United States.

Of less direct relevance to educational applications, but more satisfying in terms of specifying the mechanisms at work, is that small hand-ful of psychological studies which attempted to asses the contribution of conceptual mismatches to cognitive performance. Recent study by our colleagues Franklin and Fulani (personal communication) will suffice to illustrate the kind of work we have in mind.

Franklin and Fulani were unhappy about the comparative work on memory developement in children which seemed to show a consistent lag in higher - order conceptual and mnemonic skills in poor, Black children when compared to their anglo, middle-class counterparts. They noted that the materials for these studies were all selected from vocabulary norms taken from predominantly anglo, middle-class adults. They reasoned that if items were picked that tapped conceptual categories of importance to Black people, the differences in conceptual and mnemonic performance would dissappear, or under the proper conditions, be reversed.

Using techniques designed to be as comparable as possible to those used by Jensen in his well publicized studies, Franklin and Fulani constructed a recall list made up of common English words. However, half the words in their 30 item list formed conceptual categories that are more salient for Black than for white students. Their results confirmed not only what our common sense would predict, but raise interesting issues for psychological and psych-educational theories as well.

First, they found that Black high school dropouts out-performed anglo high schoolers in terms of both the amount recalled (small effect) and the degree to which recall was conceptually organized (a very large effect). More detailed analyses revealed that it was the presence of black-oriented items that disrupted the organization of white students. Further analysis showed that the link between recall and organization was very much a function of what was being recalled; a direct suggestion that content and process cannot

always be separated in discussions of culture and cognition, however useful this separation may be for special purposes.

Learning and Teaching Styles

Of all the areas to which we could apply the match-mismatch notion, perhaps the one that compells us most is that of learning and teaching styles, because this is, at some level, at the heart of the matter. Piestrup (1973) has dealt with this in her work on Black dialect interference and accomodation of reading instruction in first grade. Her six characterizations of teaching styles as related to early reading instruction, are potentially intructive. The most successful group of teachers were classified as Black Artful. These teachers used Black speech fluently, directly involving the children in learning reading, particularly as it relates to rhythmic play unique to Black dialect speakers; i.e. the rapid interplay of intonation and gesture, familiar to Black children as one of the art forms of Black culture.

A second group of teachers employed an interrupting approach. This approach is characterized by anticipating the child's responses and repetition of what the child said both during instruction and during reading. A third group of teachers were characterized as using the "White Liberal" approach. Teachers in this group encouraged dialect use by occasionally using it themselves,accepting dialect pronunciation, and by using the children's own writing in dialect during reading instruction. Still other teachers were characterized as focusing entirely on standard pronounciation. These teachers assumed that the children must learn standard phonology as a basis for learning to read. Other teachers emphasized decoding; the presentation of isolated English sounds for identification. A final group of teachers emphasized vocabulary.

As stated previously, the teachers characterized as Black artful were the most successful; perhaps because they involved children more directly in reading, and shared purposes and meaning in communication with them more than the others; their teaching style interferred less and accomodated more to the experience of the children, contributing to greater success in reading.

We have not meant to imply here that psychological research is without consequence in the formation and development of educational and social policy. But we have intended to caution those who would rely too heavily on the psychologist as the architect of social programming. It is our feeling that large-scale reform in this domain must come from the social-political arena, and in this regard the psychological researcher's role is a supportive one. Our own work has policy relevance in its demonstration that children who perform poorly in standardized situations are not generally or immutably incompetant.

We are very much concerned to expand the very limited domain in which such work has been carried out. As White's report (1973) makes abunbantly clear, the absence of an elucidation of the nature of cognitive development and the factors that shape it, is a major impediment to relevant child-oriented policy.

References

Cole, Michael and Scribner, Sylvia. Culture and thought: A psychological introduction. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1974.

Cole, Michael. Recall in young children. (mimeo)

Franklin, A.J., and Fulani, L. Ethnic group differences in recall based on the composition of task content. (mimeo).

Lein, Laura. Speech and setting: American migrant children in school and at home. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1973.

Piestrup, A.M. Black dialect interference and accomodation of reading instruction in first grade. Monograph #4, Language Behavior Research Laboratory, University of California, Berkley.

Quay, L.C. Language dialect, reinforcement, and the intelligence-test performance of Negro children. Child Development, 1971, 42, pp 5-15.

Quay, L.C. Negro dialect and Binet performances in severely disadvantaged black four-year-olds. Child Development, 1972, 43, pp. 245-250.

Redfield, Robert. Culture and education of the Midwestern Highlands of Guatemala. American Journal of Sociology, 1943.

Ward, M. C. Them children: A study in language learning. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. 1971.

White, Burton and Watts, Jean C. Experience and environment: Major differences in the development of the young child, Vol. I. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

Williams, Robert and Rivers, Wendell. Mismatches in testing from Black English. Paper read at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Honolulu, Hawaii, 1972.

Zigler, E.F. and Butterfield, E.C. Motivational aspects of IQ test performance of culturally deprived nursery school children. Child Development, 1968, 39, pp. 1-14.

5

V. THE CULTURAL CONTEXT OF EDUCATION

William Hall and Michael Cole

May 17, 1974

Participants in Seminar:

Peter Azure -	Director, Oregon Native American Consortium
Gwen Baker -	Assistant Professor, School of Education, University of Michigan
Beverlee Bruce -	Afro-American Studies, Harvard University
Jan Carew -	Chairman, Afro-American Studies, Northwestern University
Michael Cole -	Rockefeller University
Ron Edmonds -	Director, Center for Urban Studies, Harvard University
Fred Erickson -	Assistant Professor, Harvard Graduate School of Education
Marie Gadsden -	Phelps-Stokes Fund, Washington, D.C., College Cooperative Development Program
E. Delbert Gray -	Department of Education, State of Michigan
Bill Greenbaum -	Harvard Graduate School of Education
Bill Hall -	Chairman, Faculty Committee on Black Studies, Vassar College; and Rockefeller University
Warren Haymon -	Superintendent, Ravenswood City Schools, East Palo Alto, California
Jacquelyne Jackson -	Department of Psychiatry, Duke University Medical Center; National Advisory Council on Equality of Educational Opportunity
Sara Lightfoot -	Harvard Graduate School of Education
Bernice Miller -	Associate Director, Center for Urban Studies, Harvard University
Fritz Mosher -	Harvard Graduate School of Education and Huron Institute
Joe Price -	School of Education, University of Michigan
Gloria Primm -	Carnegie Corporation
Geneva Smitherman -	College of Education, Wayne State University

Stanley Sue - Department of Psychology, University of Washington

Kenneth Tollet - Institute for Study of Educational Policy, Howard University

Ken Tollet: I wanted to clarify my intervention today, our question about modesty. What I meant was not that the individual speakers were so modest, but that they were making modest claims for what psychology could do. I feel that perhaps psychology can do more than what they were claiming it could do; that certainly there are some psychologists, people writing about the mental ability of blacks and the poor, who are having a tremendous impact on policy formation. And there's no reason why psychologists and other students of the mind should not express positions contrary to those of people like Herrnstein and Jensen which would have policy implications also different from Herrnstein and Jensen. This is really what I was painting. In fact, I think it is good for people in various disciplines to be modest about what those disciplines can accomplish. But we need not understate what our disciplines can achieve.

Warren Haymon: I'd like to make an observation. It seems that in relationship to your question, "What further research is needed?", we need to begin to ask some new questions and seek some new answers. But before we begin to move in that direction, if a group such as this or a group such as the one this morning is going to come to some consensus, there has to be some commonality of definitions, in that we have to lay some basic things out on the table and begin to define them or attempt to define them together, and then proceed from those definitions to make some adjustments or changes. In relationship to this topic, I would relate to certain basic premises. First, schools have no cultural context as they exist today, just as they have no moral context. Second, I would point to the necessity of restructuring schools so that they deal with cultural realities, the diversity that exists. Third, there needs to be some collaboration with other agencies, so I would agree and disagree with the points

made by the presenters this morning in that they have to be a part of that collaboration if there is going to be any change. And in terms of what research is needed, I would speak to the issue of trying to get away from models and begin to deal with process. I'd like to say something about the process that we've attempted to come up with in the East Palo Alto community, called the Community-Family Guide to Education and the Community-Family Philosophy, which has six bases that I think are essential to a redefinition of education: the philosophic base, the organizational base, the curricula base, the content base, the evaluative base, and the health and social service base. We have attempted to go on through the efforts of Dr. Wilson*/, myself, and other members of the staff. I don't want to belabor the whole process of Community-Family Guide to Education, but I see a need for some commonality of definitions and some basic premises that we want to move from. Otherwise I see it as an exercise in futility to even talk about a "think tank" that's going to be different. Those of us who have acquired the necessary skills that are needed in the community have moved farther and farther away from those communities, and are not willing to make the sacrifice to come back to provide the necessary skills. I thought that we were moving in a very positive direction when we started talking about transforming the schools, because heretofore, in talking as well as in programs, we have focussed on transforming the kids. But then we got off on that and said, "Well, let's talk about transformation and transmitting," and we started playing with words and never came to any consensus. It seems to me that we must begin to ask new questions and talk about the co-equal relationships of all the entities involved in the educational process. Then, when we talk about policy making and decision making, anyone affected by decision or policy should in some way be involved in the process. We ought to come up with ways to expand the decision making and the policy making base

*Footnote

such that those who are excluded now can be included. And by inclusion I mean a right to participate without taking away any of one's cultural diversity. These are the kinds of things that I think a group like this should be about.

Bill Greenbaum: Could you talk a little bit about Nairobi Day School? I think it might help give more context to an alternative way to think about the question of transforming the schools. People are reluctant to do that.

Warren Haymon: In my personal opinion, that's not the issue today. I certainly can talk about the Nairobi Schools, even though I'm part of the public school system.

Ron Edmonds: I think at least for the moment I agree.

Bill Greenbaum: The reason I suggested it is that my impression from the Wilson article is that it's the most conceptually developed notion in the country of an alternative approach to relating community and education. And I would at least recommend the article.

Warren Haymon: I would just raise one caution. It is an alternative; it is successful to some degree. It's necessary but it's not sufficient. I say that because the public schools attract more black students, parents and families than the independent black institutions; therefore, our concentration should be on the public school setting because that's where the change needs to be made. And it seems to me that if we're going to make some impact, that's where we'll make it. Certainly we can learn from the independent black institution, or any independent institution. But as was pointed out this morning, there is a consistency in the Nation of Islan in what happens in the temple, the home, and the school. That consistency does not exist in the public setting in this country. If we can begin to work from that perspective, moving toward some consistency between home, school, and the spiritual aspect of education, the spiritual aspect of living will begin to make some impact.

Marie Gadsden: I think you hit exactly the basic problem that undergirds this

whole dilemma. Within that kind of pattern, the Muslim pattern, you have the unification of a control system, a commitment to that unification. And what you're talking about is the kind of structure where we don't have a commitment to the unification of the control system. I think you are right back to the dilemma posed this morning. For example, though I agree that the thrust to change significantly the texture of public schools is where we ought to be, I'm not at all certain that dealing with the private schools sector, particularly with minority and developing institutions, is not equally important in terms of structural change.

We work with some sixty to sixty-five developing institutions, as described by Title III agencies, which include Appalachian schools that are white, schools with a black majority, and also schools for Native Americans -- everybody that falls in that category of developing schools. I'm convinced that the texture of what's happening in this country relegates private schools to the same base as public schools. The whole texture of accreditation, of standardization, of controls, differs very little whether you're dealing with private or public schools. I think you've got to deal with both and deal with them equally. And I think there is something to be said for dealing with the private schools, particularly from the standpoint of the minorities, because there is still a basic element of control within the community that handles it. There is still a basic element of deference to that control in the community that supports it, whether it's religious or what. I know these generalizations may vary depending upon where you're talking. But if I'm talking about a school that I visited last week at Lawrenceville, Virginia, which is an Episcopal school, I could replicate what I say about it at four other Episcopal schools that are black. If I were talking about a school like Rust in Holly Springs, I could replicate what I can say about it if I were to talk about a half a dozen other schools that are under the same kind of control. And I have a

feeling that in our communities, where there is still some lingering commitment to the concept that changes can come from those leadership areas, especially in the black community, there is still a reverence for teachers in the black community. There still is a commitment to leadership from them and the kinds of schools that we work in. And I submit that many of those schools feed public school systems. I know, for example, that Rust College feeds a large number of teachers into the Memphis public school system. I know, for example, that schools like Tougaloo feed into the public school systems in Jackson. I know that these are private schools that feed and shape the performance of black teachers who go into public schools. And so I have a very strong commitment to dealing with the private sector and dealing with it quickly and firmly, because I think that especially for the black schools this is a very important sector. If we don't do it within this decade, the private schools will be gone. I have a plea to make that we deal with them too, and not just with the public school sector.

Warren Haymon: I don't think we're at odds. Certainly we have to make some impact on a number of variants, and one would be teacher education, just redefining it from teacher education as opposed to teacher training. We need to make some impact on control. We need to make some impact on educational finance and reform. There are a number of areas that we need to get into. Curriculum would be another. The point I was making in terms of the independent black institution is that that's an institution that's controlled by black people in a given segment of a given community, and it could be others as well.

Jacquelyne Jackson: What do you mean when you say independent black institutions? I don't understand what you're talking about. "Independent black institutions" are not completely under the control of black--

Warren Haymon: Right. We were talking about two different kinds of institutions. I would suggest, having visited Tougaloo and Jackson State and looked

at some of the kinds of things that happen in their teacher education programs, that their graduates will do more harm to black students in public schools than they do good. Now that's just an opinion.

Marie Gadsden: You're hitting just the problem that I'm citing. I'm suggesting that because you may argue that they do harm, one should get to them through the structure which trains them.

Jacquelyne Jackson: Not all of them. Jackson State College happens to have some students who trained under me. Let's stop making such generalizations which hold no water, and specify, for example, which students from Jackson State we're talking about, or what kinds of characteristics are those which do harm and those which do good.

Ron Edmonds: I think it's profitable to put the question in this context. That one, the question of control is critical and that in and of itself the majority complexion of the pupils in the school does not describe whether or not it's a black institution. And two, we need to be fairly specific in asking what the relationship is between who controls the institution and whether or not the people who pass through it end up being of greater or lesser service to the pupil population under discussion. To get back to the question of culture more specifically, the question of control is important because that is the origin of the cultural context in which the institution functions, and that's where you get the definition of the uses to which it should be put, and that is a cultural phenomenon.

Jacquelyne Jackson: Couldn't we raise another question? I was very cognizant when I was working at black institutions in the South some years ago, that the administrators, including superintendents and principals of various schools, are particularly derelict; and in large measure black principals, especially in the South and other places, can be blamed for problems because they deliberately set themselves to hire what I call the worst of all possible teachers

available because they wanted people who would not cause their system trouble. To lay that kind of blame at the schools is unfair. We have to go back and ask what kinds of teachers have been hired and for what reasons. What kinds of teachers were not hired and for what reasons?

Warren Haymon: I agree with what you're saying, Ron, and I think it's a proper question, but I think it's a political question and not a cultural one.

Jacquelyne Jackson: Now we need to ask you what you call "cultural," because the anthropological definition and a sociological definition of cultural would include not only the language, the education system, the economic system, but the political system as well. We need a definition of what is cultural.

Bill Hall: You're bringing up just the point we were making this morning. You give an example of black principals who hired the worst teachers because they needed to keep their job. Okay. And then to sort of lay the blame for this behavior on them, I think that skirts a social systems issue.

Jacquelyne Jackson: No, because they did not have to do it. They could have done a Patrick Henry and said I will not harm black children.

Bill Hall: Blacks in the South in 1940 did not have that kind of flexibility.

Jacquelyne Jackson: Some did and some didn't, and that again is a critical problem. You see precisely those who took that kind of flexibility are why we are where we are now.

Ron Edmonds: I think that if our articulation of reform issues depends on the availability of large numbers of people who are prepared to martyr themselves, we aren't going to be able to put together a very productive construct.

Gwen Baker: Picking up on what has been said about teacher education and diversity, if we are to have any reform at all or to make some decisions about policy making, teacher training institutions certainly have to be aware of the kinds of things we're talking about. And while our speakers this morning address themselves to a certain portion of the cultural context of education,

I would say seventy-five percent of the focus was on academic achievement, and rightly so, because that does lead to economic stability and access, which is extremely important to all of us. However, I would like to have some response to the other approach -- the humanistic approach -- which Geneva mentioned briefly this morning. What are we doing with teachers in training, and how are we preparing or helping them to help prepare not only black youngsters but all youngsters to be able to develop the kind of understanding for the awareness and sensitivity levels that they need to develop in a world that is diverse, in the society of the United States which is diverse, so that they have the skills that are necessary to get along with people and to function? Academic achievement is one thing and money is one thing, but there is still another element and I wish someone would respond to that aspect.

Joe Price: Before people deal with that question, I have need to go back to Warren's concern a little earlier about some fundamental issues. I heard you presenting a strategy which from my point of view was opposed to a policy issue, and the question for me is, do we really feel it's essential to have community control in order to generate models that would be effective in working with minority children?

Warren Haymon: What do you mean by community? My definition of community includes parents, residents in the community, teachers, administrators, and students. That's a community. And in terms of community control, entities from each of those particular groups would be involved in the decision making. Now maybe that's not the definition of community and community control that others have, so before we move any further, we ought to identify what the definitions are.

Stan Sue: I'd like to come back to Joe's point because I've been thinking about Bill and Mike's presentation. The thing that bothers me is this. On balance, I think the paper is really an advocacy kind of paper, that is, trans-

mission versus transformation issues, good issues, I think, outlining those things plus a caution on psychological research and what it means in terms of implementing policy. But I think we have to balance that with a specific development of specific strategies for change. The reason I say this is twofold. First of all, I think society has asked minorities to be patient too long. "Wait till we get a lot of facts in before we act." Somehow that's been used as a justification for doing nothing. And I feel an urgency to start outlining what kinds of programs we want. We've known for a long time that tests are culturally biased. And the strategy that you outlined, uses of certain games, was an interesting one; that is, in certain games, minorities have better recall and better conceptual kinds of skills. Now how can we devise that into a real strategy for some sort of program? That's what I'm very concerned about.

Gwen Baker: That goes back to my earlier question. It's a larger question that just the methodology or strategy, Bill, as you interpret it. It's getting the people who are in the decision-making positions not only to acknowledge the various cultures, but to do something with that, and I'm not just talking about the minority or the ethnic cultures, but all children. If you're just talking about black children, and teaching black children that black is beautiful, that's fine. But the minute you open that door and let them out of a black situation, no one else has that same concept about blacks and their blackness really has no meaning because they've got to deal with a bigger world. What are we doing with those people about culture in a larger dimension? For me, the context of education takes on a much larger meaning.

Ron Edmonds: I think that there is a relationship between Stan's interest in the testing question, between the description of community control mechanisms, and between your pragmatic interest in delivery, and that is that one of the models that exists for how you combine all those things in a cultural and controlled context is that normative standardized measures have the effect

of putting in the hands of the people who develop the measures, the control of what intelligence is and/or the control of what achievement is. If you introduce both the concept of culture and the concept of political control, then that means that one device for dealing with all those is to say that you won't use any normative standardized measures, that instead you want criteria measures. That opens the question of who gets to establish the criteria. And that takes you to the cultural context, and that takes you to the technology of assessment and to the questions of control and accountability for delivery and all the rest. So I think that the technology is there but it still doesn't get us off Mike and Bill's interest in the relationship between the psychologist's ability to describe the cultural context, the technologist's ability to deliver the hardware. But that still leaves us with the political devices for getting it done.

Jacquelyne Jackson: Why are you giving the psychologist this ability to describe the cultural context?

Ron Edmonds: Because I think that for both community controlled schools and public schools there is a critical question of how does anybody know whether or not the public institution, and that's what we're primarily interested in in this discussion, how does anybody know when the public institution is delivering, as long as you don't have instruments of assessment and instruments that permit the public observation of what the institution is delivering? Without such instruments, the educator or the bureaucrat is free to use his own best judgment in telling you whether or not progress is being made, whether or not achievement is being attained, and in fact, he gets to define what achievement is. And he gets to define what pupil mastery is. But if what we're talking about here is the mix between cultural context and political authority, then that means that we're interested in the mix between what psychologists can do in the way of helping to give appropriateness to the

measures of assessment and the opportunities that those measures raise for having political instruments for altering the control mechanisms that now exist in public schools.

Jacquelyne Jackson: It seems to me that's precisely what we are offering and has often been used as measures which have been developed by psychologists to determine what students are doing, or what they're doing including the extent to which they show maturity and so forth and so on. And this has been one of the problems. Those measures are not valid. We need to think in terms of survival research questions about what kinds of persons or representatives are needed, if you will, on an interdisciplinary team to bring forth all the kinds of materials that would be available to give us these beneficial materials.

Warren Haymon: I would also say that you need to expand the evaluation base so that you have some intra-accountability within that system that evaluates what happens between students and other students, what happens between students and teachers, what happens between parents and students. And then if you also expand your philosophic base to one that deals with the humanistic aspects of education, then you begin to be concerned about evaluating whether or not that system is doing those kinds of things. Again, it seems to me that we are still operating without any basic definitions or any consensus on those, and at the same time we are putting things in isolation so to speak, and it's not that kind of ballpark. It's one that is so broad that it takes in many different kinds of things and many different kinds of people. It seems to me that we're victims of our own language. In all schools of education, from the first year to the last we talk about individual differences. And even in those schools, we begin to grade the students based on what they do on a midterm and a final examination. That perpetuates itself right out into the public strata. But we have all the "answers" if we just go by the jargon that we use in the schools of education. We're always talking about "individual differences," the "rate

of learning," the "retention curve," and how you forget eighty percent of what you know by the time you get to the end of the quarter. And then we turn right around and duplicate these kinds of things in the system that we call a public education system, and we say we're going to move students from one level to another.

Peter Azure: I find myself in the position where I have an extremely difficult time trying to relate the papers presented here to the concerns of our people. I don't think we need to compare our culture to any on this continent. As an example of my difficulty, when I received the abstract of this morning's paper in the mail and began to read it, I literally had to get a dictionary to figure out parts of what was meant there. Where I come from in Oregon and Alaska, we've been studied to death. We've been studied by anthropologists, we've been studied by psychologists, we've been hooked up to every kind of machine there is invented. And let me tell you now that we have no use for a psychologist. I have a couple of Ph.D. psychologists on my staff and they're the most worthless people I have on the whole staff. And I don't mean this derogatorily, primarily because I don't know you as individuals. I'm speaking about the two people that are working with us. As far as our people's position is concerned, at least the people that I work with, regarding education and educational policy and social policy, we're in a position where it's a last ditch stand for us. This is evident in the work of the American Indian Consortium of Higher Education. It's evident in the programs that we're fighting to establish in our communities. We're in a position now where we either do it ourselves or it's not going to get done and we forget about it and say nothing beyond that point. We're establishing our schools so that we can teach our young people the languages. We're there because we believe in the languages. We are in our last step really, educationally, to try to work within this system. We're working at establishing some credibility to our own section of accreditation, because

there are schools all over the country that are ripping off all the funds to get things started within our communities. We want to stop that. For many years we've held a special relationship to the federal government. We've held a special relationship within this continent. We've had many things taken from us. And we look at people who come and study us. We look at people who come and take pictures of us. We look at them very cautiously. And I hope that as you work with people of the Native American community, you don't see this as a negative factor. I hope that you see it as a conditioned response to the things that this country has done with regard to our people in the educational system. We at least want the opportunity to try on our own. If we don't make it this time, we'll know that we have failed ourselves.

I think basically that's what I've heard a number of people allude to this morning. Some have called it community control, others have called it involvement of parents, students, teachers, any number of people within your communities. I think that it's really very difficult to compare the situation of Native American people to any of your situations. Fortunately, in our area we have a reservation. It's a strong reservation and economically it's the best off reservation in the country and probably one of the smallest. We have a unique opportunity and a unique responsibility to the native people from our area. We have an opportunity to develop, call them models if you want, call them pilot projects or whatever. If the school district doesn't like what we're proposing to do, we can tell them, "Okay, you guys split and we'll go our own way. We can make our own county because of our special relationship in this country." We have developed programs that teach native languages from Head Start all the way up. We have programs in which our oldest instructor is seventy-three years old. He's a history instructor for us in our institution. Yet he didn't get beyond the eighth grade. He's no stupid man, he's nearly seventy-four years old. He hasn't been past the eighth grade, but he's

got a wealth of American history within him. As far as I know it's the only true oral history class being taught anywhere in this country, the one that is taught by him. We have something that we can offer, we would like to offer.

My reason for wanting to come here to be with a group of people such as this is not only to hopefully give you some kind of insights into the type of thing that our people are aspiring to accomplish, but also to get you to consider us as a people; everybody else as people, I guess is what it really amounts to. And as I said, I don't mean to really say bad things about psychologists in general. I have learned one thing. All the time I was in school and my college experience, through a few degrees, has really been almost worthless to me. I really wonder sometimes whether or not I'd have been better off being taught by a medicine man. I hope that as you have an opportunity to influence social policy and educational policy throughout the country, that you'll consider the other minorities of the country also. We'll help when we can and I hope you'll do the same.

Stanley Sue: Can I follow that up? Because I've been feeling uncomfortable, in a sense, being Chinese-American. I know the viewpoint is that Asian-Americans in general don't have problems in the educational system, despite the current attention to bilingual problems. But if we are going to talk about cultural context, we really do have to talk about Native Americans, the Spanish-speaking, and Asian-Americans. I think that there's a cost associated in the case of Asian-Americans with not responding to that. You know, many Asian-Americans will always succeed on IQ tests or whatever that are mainstream, but I'm concerned about the psychological cost associated with that, in that you lose a part of your own culture. That is, to be mainstream, to succeed, almost implies that you do lose some of your own pride and knowledge of culture. So when we talk about the cultural context, we ought to depart from the mainstream and talk about all different cultures.

Jan Carew: I think the Indian brother here brought into very sharp focus some of the contradictions that were in the arguments preceding his talking. And contradictions about this country and educational systems and concepts of community control and concepts about the role of psychologists as sort of glorified juju men who are going to create some kind of magical thing that will solve everything for us, and so on. Psychologists have a role to play. That role is limited. Its function in terms of applicability are limited by the nature of the society in which they live and the reasons why we have educational systems functioning. I want to deal with two issues and I think they are two major issues. The first is community control, which obsesses any kind of discussion of education in the urban centers and has a back and forth thing built into it. What is community control?

At Rutgers, we started Livingston College following the Newark riots, and we now have admissions of new elements in the university stream. There is a euphoric belief shared by some that Livingstone is an entity unto itself and that we are going to control it. And then there are questions of local government, state government, federal government's decisions at the point of financing these colleges and hierarchies that pile up on top of that particular experiment which are ignored. So when we talk of community control, we have to go back to the original thing we're talking about: what is this education going to do? Are we going to mobilize our psychologists and so on into the task of creating subversives who are going to undermine the system that has obviously and patently failed, not only in this country but throughout the world? Are psychologists expected to provide the kind of answers we are looking for?

The second point I wanted to raise when the Indian brother was asking for an understanding of his community, is the perversion of the history of this hemisphere to the point where every kind of activity we carry out is

predicated on something other than an understanding that this is a circular society into which Columbus in 1492 was discovered by the Lukiues (?) and the Arawakan tribe on the beaches one morning. We have to teach our children a new history, and if we don't teach them that history then all of the psychological problems that we have to deal with begin.

What are we doing now with all these piecemeal communities? We are trying to resolve some of the contradictions by different methods and specific investigations into different corners of scholarship.

Ken Tollet: When we speak of community control and the problem of what psychologists and other so-called experts can do, aren't we overlooking the managerial revolution, the technostructure that Galbraith talked about? Are there any institutions in our industrialized society today which are not governed and run to a large extent by experts? Now I know one must be cautious about analogies, but the suggestion has been made that American businesses are certainly not run on policy, to a large extent it's not formed by stockholders, the owners. And when you get to the school system, I wonder to what extent even the school board forms and establishes policy. The superintendents, the principals, the teachers and so forth, would be the technostructure that Galbraith talks about in industry. Shouldn't we examine a little more self-consciously what experts and intellectuals are doing with whatever institutions we're talking about? Isn't there a serious problem with translating the wishes of a community into programs that are not distorted and refracted by the experts and intellectuals who actually manage and operate the schools and institutions? I'm again raising the question of what will be accomplished if we get community control, and restating my point that psychologists, educationists, and the other people who make up the bureaucracies have tremendous influence on how they operate and what they do, and we cannot lightly say, "Well, our constituency is a community and we're going to do what the community wants." Our minds have

been trained a certain way and we operate a certain way. The question is how. How can we really get a complex institution, no matter what it is, to be genuinely responsive to the aspirations of a broadly defined constituency?

Ron Edmonds: The answer to that, Ken, probably lies in the disparate nature of the people in this room, who are in fact prepared to serve communities in just the difficult way that you suggest. It seems to me that part of our task is to determine how the people in this room, given the limited range or resource they represent, hook up with the further extension of resource that others of us represent in a way that makes the range eventually broad enough so as to make a less skeptical question.

Warren Haymon: One answer is creating a new process. It seems to me that the school board membership is not compatible with the system that's serving the people. That produces a conflict. Basically, there are no advocates for children usually on that board. So I would propose a collegial process where you move the board closer to the individual school setting and create community board structures. Again, I speak to the public school nature and, of course, in my particular community, which is perhaps vastly different because of the size and its population. About the management accountability question that you raised, it seems to me that there are six responsibilities under management accountability that formulate the management system that can be transferred from the business world to the educational world. And those six management accountability responsibilities would be establishing goals and objectives to begin with, relating those goals and objectives to the needs and interests of the constituency that you serve. But the question always raised there is, who determines what those interests and needs are? The second management accountability responsibility, it seems to me, is the design of an organizational delivery system that would meet those goals and objectives. Third, provision for staff development in this management accountability system so that the

staff will in fact be able to deliver. Fourth, an evaluation system to determine whether or not you are delivering. Fifth is coalition building such that you don't consider the educational system as an entity of itself but rather cooperating with other institutions that service the same population that have the same problems. And finally, team development within the system itself so that you can begin to mesh management styles and management skills. This would eliminate some of the automatic conflicts that develop in line-staff relations. I think these are worth consideration as we discuss the issue of community boards and the issue of management accountability in the public school setting.

Mike Cole: I'd like to try and tie what Mr. Azure was saying with what Mr. Haymon was saying,, and I picked up two phrases that might be useful. I think that a lot of the discussion is almost technocratic, working from a whole lot of givens, and I would hope to hear people talk a little bit more about the givens, because what Bill and I were trying to say is, "You've been given a pile of shit." That was what we were trying to say. If that's what you start with, that's what you're going to end up with, no matter which way you twist and turn. We may be wrong, but I think Mr. Azure was perhaps saying that there is a real point to that. I want to tie that to the number one starting point, Mr. Haymon, establishing goals and objectives. Now what goals and objectives? You don't want to start with the educational establishment and then say what your goals and objectives are. What is the goal and objective of raising your children? What do you want them to become? And then if you can ask some questions that start before you get to school, you can say, "How do we get them to be that way?" If you start with the system you've got now, I think you're just buying an enormous amount of frustration, and a lot of the talk that Bill and I were putting out comes exactly from the feeling of being used and not liking being used and how we get out of being used. You get out of being used by questioning people's basic assumptions about what is going on. I think

that if Mr. Azure really wants to pursue that line of reasoning, then I've got to ask you, do you really want to set up something like Muslim schools? Muslims do. They set up what from any account is a most standardized kind of curriculum with some other stuff put on top of it to try to make it work for some of the kinds of continuity. I think you've got to go back to real first principles and ask, what in the world are we doing with our children, and why? There's an enormous amount of money being laid out there. If you want to start with community control of the schools, then you're starting with community control of an inadequate pie which is guaranteed to do a lousy job when you're all done. I really believe that.

Fred Erickson: Do you guys have anything to say to people who have decided what they want to do and what they want their kids to be like? About how to do it? Because presumably that really is what you're supposed to be good at. I think it would be interesting to hear. We can admit what you said about the limitations on psychology, and since you're here, maybe we ought to talk about it.

Mike Cole: Well, it depends on what the nature of the discussion really is. I think that's an extremely limited discussion. I think what psychologists know in a controlled situation I have never ever seen in operation in a classroom, because classrooms are not experiments. Okay? And so again people are going to say I'm copping out. I can go ahead and talk about what it means for teachers to change their view of what children can do. There are things that I would do, like taking kids outside of their classroom and a bunch of stuff that I think could be tied to community control. But I think that we still have some very basic problems, because we're going to lose control of what we can do, and if we can con the pre-schoolers, we can control the grammar school kids, and then after that you can just forget it, because there's a world out there that you have very little control of and the parents don't have control of it. So I'd

really go back to a strong community control idea, but what's the community doing? And I hate to see people start with a bill of goods that's been sold to them. When they unfortunately discovered Columbus, they also discovered, unbeknownst, a kind of an educational system which has been with this continent ever since and which is causing us a lot of trouble. And not one person in all this time has brought up and started to debate the whole notion of deschooling society and redistributing the funds that are currently used for misallocating people to some other more useful purpose.

Fred Erickson: Before you go back to that, Mike, what about the issue Ron was raising before, which really is a measurement issue, of how you tell when you've reached the goals that you want and whether if you don't accept the tests that are now used to tell you that, there are other ways you can use?

Michael Cole: You know that that's about a four-hour rap. That's one of the problems with that discussion. We had this discussion about the invalidity of tests. And here I just apologize for the special usages that go on because you've got to be exceedingly clear about what you're talking about. One of the real terrible things about IQ tests is that conditionally they work, just like conditionally schools work. And I think that IQ tests, if you're talking about correlations between test performance and school performance, work in the sense that that's the best instrument anybody has to say who is likely to succeed in school. Now it's an absurd kind of validity because I can produce it by taking an English test out to Mr. Azure's reservation and he can transfer it into a local Indian language and give it back to me and I'll flunk it, right? It's still the case that taught in English, in his school, that test will be predictive; I will flunk. So in that sense the tests are valid. What they're not valid for are a bunch of the other ancillary generalizations that are made for them, which is really the onus that all minority group peoples are put under, and that's where the standardization issue comes in. That's why I get back

to the notion that we can change people's ideas about children's abilities, their non-fixed nature, and the relationship between the problems they're being asked to solve and their past experience and what psychological process they haven't applied. We can do that as psychologists, I think, and do a modestly good job at it, and we're right at the beginning of it. But what we cannot do is re-structure the forces that make kids behave stupidly, vis-a-vis the school. And since that's the criterion that everybody's using, if you get into that system, you're dead in it.

Jan Carew: You mentioned Muslim schools, Bill, and then in passing you talked about the new schooling, examining the question of deschooling the schools. That takes us into de-institutionalizing the institutions and de-societizing the society and finally not having any government, and the withering away of the state, as probably an excellent thing. I have just come from Chicago, having talked with teenagers who have been to Muslim schools. I thought of Lord Buddha. You know, Lord Buddha was surrounded by walls and never saw any evil. Every time he went outside, everything was removed, and then one day he saw a beggar and the whole thing broke down. The Muslim teenagers are now going out into the society with this particular kind of community concentration which gives them an entirely new cosmology, a very simple and workable one for a while that the white man is a devil and that he has persecuted black people, all of this with enough truths in it to make the students embrace the thing. But there is far more complexity outside there when that teenager gets out. So he is back into the community and back facing the same problems that we're talking about here. You have these contradictions creeping in, which one has to be careful about when you say the Muslim school.

Beverlee Bruce: I was going to say several things. From my experience, many people who talk about community control are talking about in in terms of an attempt to establish a new social order. And so it isn't just a question of

taking over a rotten piece of pie and seeing what you can get out of it. And that speaks of the whole question of developing a humanistic social order with a whole new set of personal relationships. And I think, for instance, in the community school movement particularly as it applies to blacks, people have used the colonial analogy in which they see the whole method of decolonization as part of the process of educating people to a new way of looking at the world, and this whole question of validity and testing and so forth and so on has no meaning unless you really control the institution. I see community control as part of a process. Culture does not exist in the abstract. You have values, beliefs, ideas that are expressed in behavior and are also institutionalized. It's very difficult, it seems to me, for black people or any other minorities who have been shut out of the process, to just assume that they can petition someone else who is in control to do what they need done for themselves. What it really is is seizing power. To do for yourself what has to be done.

To give an example, even in Los Angeles in '69, when the testing was valid, the smartest children in the city of Los Angeles were black children. It was a middle class community. They beat out kids who lived in Bel Air, where people have homes that cost $750,000, etc. The black community was euphoric. The white principal was very cautious. Well, maybe there was something wrong with the way the test was administered. We cannot be too happy. In other words, your argument where the schools are based on fostering inequality so that even when people come out with quality behavior in a system that would be fine for them to be unequal, we've got to mitigate the circumstance. There was a mistake. In other words, these black children should not have scored higher than anyone else. And rather than look at this as a model for improving other urban schools with a predominantly black population, all kinds of excuses were given for people not to be too excited that these black children had in fact done well on their

own measurements. When I say their own, I mean the system's method of measurement.

Mike Cole: Just to respond to Mr. Carew. Muslim schools were not held up as a model of how to do things. They were held up as an example of where a community takes control of its own schools and tries to build education in its image, whatever its image ought to be. We were advocating that it be looked at to see what its successes and failures were, not holding it up as a model of any particular way of doing education. I view a lot of the talk about deschooling, at least at the present time, as exaggerated, and I'm not a particular fan of Ivan Illich's. Nevertheless I think that there are very, very serious problems that he is pointing to. I do think that there is a problem, as Burns mentioned. If you're into a system, you can get control at one level and have it undone by the larger system in which you're working, no matter how well you do. I'm not saying you then fold up your tents and go home. I'm saying you recognize that if you're going to have a policy institute, and dealing with education as a part of the social fabric is what your institute is going to do, then just realize that that's the state of affairs and we're not going to run out of contradictions for a long time.

Bill (?): The crucial point that we were trying to make this morning is just that. Psychology is useful but of very limited use because of the points you just made about Los Angeles.

Marie Gadsden: I'm still distressed by the lack of substance in what's coming out. And I still think we haven't confronted the reality of the dilemma. For example, you can talk about community control, you can talk about any of these system problems that we can identify. But back of that control is most frequently money. Who decides on how that money will be spent, and who decides on how to marshall the human resources and the material resources to spend that money or to implement whatever plan people decide must be implemented? I'd like to

relate a recent experience. I was in one of the Bureaus in Washington talking with someone who grants large sums of money, and this young man was very sympathetic to the proposal which I had brought to him for his reaction. He made a very interesting suggestion to me. He said, "I'm sympathetic with what you're saying and I would like to endorse it. But I'd like to give you the names of eight or nine people. If you can sell what you have to say to these eight or nine people, I can endorse what you are asking for and you can get it." He further said, "These people are the people that receive from this administration the request to tell this administration what to say and what to endorse." He said, "These are the people who establish educational policy for monies from this government." Now as far as I'm concerned, a major strategy for us is to identify that kind of lise and to learn how to deal with that kind of list; that's the kind of education I'm interested in. I'm a pragmatist, and that's the kind of education I'm interested in. I'm interested in finding the men who will give me a list like that. And I'm interested in finding how to get to them. And I'm interested in having an idealistic approach and having strategies for changing people, but I've spent a half century being frustrated by supporting ideals and working through this kind of things and still recognizing that I come back to that essential pragmatic basis of finding who controls the money and the power and convincing them that I'd better get a slice of it or I can do something to make it unpleasant for them. I mean it's as simple as that.

Jan Carew: You raised a very important issue. Yes, it is important to get those certain people. But one of the things that struck me about Illich's experiment was that he took some Mexican peasants off the land and they mastered certain areas of technology very well that they weren't supposed to master unless they went to Harvard and studied electronic engineering and so on. So the knowledge that we are dealing with two practical poles, you're going to the man to get this money, but also knowing that in a limited context there are certain

goals that we can actually achieve in the experiments at the grassroots, which my friend is doing there and which is very necessary, so that we go from that particular to the general to the international, because it is a fact of the age we live in that we have a sort of technological revolution taking place which makes it possible not only in this country and in Mexico, where Illich is carrying out his experiment, but also in Ethiopia, which has the most sophisticated workshops for repairing jet engines on the continent of Africa. This is a kind of things that I feel we need to discuss simultaneously, that there are so many cross-currents and underlying factors.

Fred Erickson: While psychologists don't have power and academicians don't have power and school administrators don't have power and you can folways find a superordinant hierarchy that's limiting you, I'm still enough of an idealist to think that ideas sometimes, in the right context, do have power. And it seems to me that the keystone of what Dr. Hall and Dr. Cole are saying and have said is that deficit theories are intellectually bankrupt, and we can't infer incompetence from performance. We don't know what we can infer competence from, but we know we can't infer incompetence from the way people act either in tasks or in classrooms or whatever. And while it might not cause the withering away of the state, if you could find an arena in which to tell those seven people on that enemy list that, there might be some effect.

I was thinking about ten years ago I was sitting with some ghetto kids from Chicago who were hired on an on-the-job training program to be trained to measure pieces of steel, because the company felt they didn't know how to do that. And so the company spent about $45,000 to train twelve kids to measure steel down to an eight of an inch correctly, and they already could do that. But they took them all away to camp to have a T-troup, and the people who planned that conference as an entertainment selected a film. They wanted something the kids would be interested in, so they got an action movie. We

were all sitting in this kind of luxurious camp setting, and they brought out the movie and the projector and it was Gunga Din. You know, it seems to me that the problem of Gunga Din is what we're talking about. Why is it that the British soldiers are running Gunga Din's life instead of vice versa? It was not because Gunga Din was not competent. It wasn't even because he wasn't humanistic, because remember he was a better man than they were but for carrying water. In that whole business of why Gunga Din is where he is, and the whole assumption of whatever we do with the Gunga Dins of the world, we've first got to fix them, because there's something intrinsically wrong with them or they would have the British administrative hierarchy and they would have the guns. It's that kind of thinking that has to be challenged. And I'm really puzzled why the New York Times says, "You've got to refute Jensen and come up with the final refutation of that." I mean that bothers me, because it seems to me that the logic of your argument is just as good as his.

Ron Edmonds: I'd like to bring the question a little closer to home, Fred. As Mike said this morning, Cultural Context of Learning and Thinking was written almost five years ago and has been abroad now for a long time. A lot of our senior colleagues on Appian Way are not only practitioners of deficit programming, but they conceived of the notion and sent it abroad. And I'd like to reduce it to the most polite question I can think of: why weren't they there this morning? -- quite aside from the rhetorical question of why wasn't the book reviewed in the New York Times. The answer is that the substance of the notion that is being conveyed has nothing to do with its efficacy, that its only value in the context of the work that this is a part of is, two things, it seems to me.. One, that parents must under existing circumstances send their children to school for the foreseeable future, and they need instruments by which they can gain at least some modicum of greater control over having to subject their children to that experience. And however modest that

reform may be, I think it's worthwhile. That's one. The second reason for pursuing these questions is that in the discussions of community control, in the discussions of the euphoria of the possibilities that that raises, we have no way of knowing what schools would look like if they served the people that go to them. And that even means that it's possible that schools would not in fact teach children much of anything that now passes for curriculum. But we'll never know that if (1) the captives don't have greater means by which to pry doors open in the institutions, and (2) even when opportunities for intrusion occur, that it is important that people have in hand some substantive description of what can be done and what ought to be done and how it can be done and so forth. And that answers for me the pragmatic question of why these questions are worthy of consideration and pursuit and all the rest.

Sara Lightfoot: I want to get beyond that rhetorical question of why most of the Harvard faculty was not at the discussion this morning. I'm tired of that discussion. And I know the answer; we all do. I want to get beyond that to ask some of the questions that it seems to me were important this morning. What are the things we have to pay attention to? How can we free up our minds to ask new research questions? The interesting part of this morning's discussion for me was the question about motivation. How are kids motivated to do it, as it was asked this morning? How can we get Johnny to give a damn? Or why should Johnny give a damn? It seems to me that people even in this discussion have assumed that cognitive activities are different from emotional activities are different from social activities. And my sense is that it is all quite wrapped up. That the whole notion of trying to teach black kids in a motivational way, giving them pieces of candy for work that they know is not important, is obviously not anything that is going to motivate them. It wouldn't motivate me. I see kids, I go into a classroom in my naive days, last week, or last year, and I begin to mark off on my observation schedule when the teacher is approving

and therefore motivating kids. That's what I'm thinking and obviously the teacher's approving and giving positive reinforcement to everything the kid is saying. But the kids are not motivated; no one's happy. So I say, what's wrong? Obviously she's giving positive reinforcement, but it's not positive reinforcement. Because the kids know the questions are important to their lives, because the kids know they're not being demanded of, and it seems to me that I want to get to questions of really looking at social contexts of classrooms. It's been my saw and it will continue to be my saw to understand the dynamics, to free ourselves up. It seems to me that the research questions that have been asked on Appian Way are not the important ones, because people have this other ideological commitment and their research is reinforcing those ideological goals. My question is, if we do have different sorts of ideological goals for education, aren't we in a particularly good position to ask new kinds of research questions that are quite different from the old ones? That would provide an opportunity to say, what is motivation? Where does it come from? Let's look at some kids and watch them play in a natural setting. Let's understand the things that are making them go. Let's not go in with prescribed, predetermined ways of viewing their behavior or what education is or should be about, but rather with a very, very different orientation that's much more positive. And that's the only reason I'm in this business. Also, get off the Appian Way, and play the piano or dance, because that makes me happier. It seems to me that we, as minority people, are in a particularly advantageous position.

Jan Carew: I think you have touched on a very important point. Motivation ties in with the Muslim experiment, and it ties in with perhaps the most extensive modern experiment in education concerned with motivating people whom conventional systems of education had failed to touch at all. I'm speaking of the literacy program in Brazil, with Paulo Freire, who began in three months

to achieve results that the previous five years could not yield. He did it simply by politicizing the Brazilian peasant to whom he was addressing this literacy program and winning from him a kind of enthusiasm to learn which simply had not existed before. My idea is that the Muslims provide a cosmology for that time that answers questions that have never been answered in this educational system before.

Sara Lightfoot: What do you mean by cosmology?

Jan Carew: It begins in the child's mind, whether for better or for worse, to reconstruct an ontological system in which that child can live. He says, "Look, the reason for our deprivation lies in the fact that the God that was worshipped was a white man's God, basically." He says that there is now a black God that is far more responsive to our needs. So they begin from the top of a hierarchy to give you some models to look at. And then it comes all the way down to your life. So the child outside is looking at a God who is really a white God, and has many contradictions to deal with, quite unconsciously, as he is coming through. This is the clever thing that our intellectuals in this hemisphere have never really dealt with. And then you find anywhere in this country, you find a Garvey*/ movement or whatever you have. Behind that is that underlying reconstruction of a hierarchy. Then one is touching on the issue of motivation. You are not starting it half-way down the line, but you are going to the very top to reconstruct the hierarchy for that child to live by, placing in it images that he can respond to and see himself in, functioning with some dignity. In talking about motivation, we would like to find modern images for a child to respond to.

The question of your motivation has got to take into account the whole context in which you see the world. That gives me cosmology. How do you see the world? How do you see yourself in the world? How do you see your people

*Footnote

in the world, your community, your family? If you are seeing yourself at a disadvantage from the beginning, I think the question of motivation has tensions built in to make the students say, "To hell with it. Why should I? Why should I follow these tenets? They haven't worked. They've told us to be patient; they said they carried out the civilizing nation. It is full of contradictions." They made it punishable by death to read and write up into the 1860's. And then they say you were civilized by this process and that this whole system is a continuation of that false thesis. So we are now coming to the question, what are you going to do about all this?

I'd like to pause and consider the issue of the deficit model again. If we find that we're defining problems wrong, that is, if we're saying that minorities aren't deficient, then what are we doing with tutorial programs or with Head Start or all these other things? I think the basic assumption here is that if we're going to get minorities to participate, we have to define what our goals are and then move toward that, rather than saying that the goals are really to put people back into the mainstream. How best to do that? I think the mainstream that we're working toward is very corrupt.

Bill Cole (??Bill Hall? Mike Cole?): Jan's comments go back to the reason I wanted to push Warren to say more about Ravenswood, although in some sense, I don't really want to hear about the reality of it. It's one of those things where you live. I mean I think Jan is now talking about an alternative system of meaning in which everything is turned upside down or turned right side up, if you will. People of the Soviet Union or people of Red China or Tanzania today are hoping for social systems which might be more humane. And I can see Freire as a frontier, as a hope for us. I've had this notion about the way Dr. Wilson laid out the concept of what was desired in East Palo Alto. That it was a total system, it was holistic, it was a way of taking each of the pieces of what had been laid on people psychologically, socially, in religious

terms, in cultural terms and begin to unlayer them. To do an archeology of the spirit and get down to more basic meanings. It fits into something that Anthony Wallace, the anthropologist, called "revitalization movements."

When you use the phrase community control, you are dealing with a polar case. It's saying, "Schools are not enough. Control of schools is not enough; it must involve the community. It must involve, in this case, some notion of extended family relationships."

Joe Price: What is it that we're using for a common frame of reference? Is it the notion that we feel that people from a given community ought to have the power to control the voice that determines what should happen? Or are we saying that we can really operate in terms of a political sphere, an educational sphere, across ethnic lines, some kind of collaborative model? Are other people in concert with what's being said?

Ron Edmonds: Joe, as far as the numbers are concerned, we're overwhelmed. We did not anticipate so many. As for the most proper use of the time, in some respects it's our responsibility to go back to this and to extract from it whatever there is in it that is mose useful. I know that there are all manner of disparate things being said. On the one hand I'm sorry that it can't meet people's agendas more directly, but for our purposes, I'm not nearly as unhappy as some of you are probably frustrated.

Beverlee Bruce: After all, we have inherited a world that we didn't make and we are trying to change it. And however much time has preceded us, those who also tried have met with failure. Therefore I don't think that we could expect in an evening and a day to really come up with definitive statements.

Geneva Smitherman: It was my understanding that we might talk about the conceptual underpinnings and the sort of ideology of a policy center, what indeed might be its objectives. And that we might here lay out some programmatic mechanisms, which could be a part of that institution that could help bring

this social order into being. And I'm very concerned that we're not plugging into that, especially from the point of view of some stuff that Gwen talked about earlier in terms of the middle class Anglo kid is getting a culture of transmission. But maybe he ought to be getting an education which transforms this culture, because the kind of culture that is being transmitted is one that has been very dehumanizing and exploitative of other people, and not tolerant of cultural diversity. I'm hoping that at least one thing that this policy center will do is set educational policy on a broad base, not just talk about policy for minorities.

Ron Edmonds: I think that we established some time ago among ourselves that there were two agendas and that they are not even rank ordered. One agenda has to do with making the phenomenon of education serve people who participate in it without being able to say at this point exactly what that means. The second is that it's easier in some respects to talk about what educational reform is most required for suburban middle class white children. It is the interruption of ethnocentrism, the demise of racism, the destruction of the materialism, and on and on. And so in some respects the legitimacy of our sophistication about deficit models is that some of us know where the deficiencies and pathologies are and that it clearly will not profit the minorities to turn institutions to their own service if at the same time we don't attend to the means by which the origin of disability and pathology is attended to. That means that there are needs in black urban schools that we ought to serve in whatever resourceful way we can, while at the same time there are needs in white suburban schools that have absolutely nothing to do with the former, and they must be served also.

Ken Tollet: I want to comment on this deschooling business. I think talk about deschooling society is mischievous and fatuous. Of all the reports that the Carnegie Commission has issued, which I was a part of, the one that I

think speaks least to the interests of blacks and minorities is Less Time, More Options, the one that talked about dropping in and dropping out and the like, because it seems to me it had a rhetoric that getting educated is not all that important. We had another report about alternative channels to education, to learning. We have to be very sophisticated in the way we talk about policy, and we have to keep in mind that there are different audiences to whom we are addressing our remarks. It is a given that the overwhelming majority of blacks, certainly parents, have very high aspirations for their children, education-wise. Blacks believe that upward social mobility can be obtained through education. We're always talking about being responsive to the community and to the masses and so forth, and I think we do them a great disservice if we engage in a rhetoric that undercuts, in fact, what they want. We aren't gods to tell them what they want. I have seen no study that indicates, even coming from the conservative quarters, that a measure of social mobility does not come from schooling. So I would imagine a reason that has not been brought up already is that we all sense how irrelevant that notion is to the black experience. This is not to say we shouldn't read Ivan Illich and get some insight. I think there are great insights in what he has written.

Now maybe the way to summarize or talk about what an agenda should be for an institute growing out of these seminars could come from my stating what the Institute for the Study of Educational Policy is about. We have three broad objectives. The first one is to issue an annual report on the status and needs of blacks in higher education. We intend to obtain a comprehensive data base on where blacks are, what they're doing. We've got a laundry list five or six pages long, regarding data we want to collect about blacks. We want to do a commentary on it and try to get some authoritative figures on, for instance, how many blacks graduate from predominantly white institutions. No one seems to know. The second objective is to evaluate and monitor the impact of law

and social science research upon the status and needs of blacks in higher education. It means that we will engage in an impact analysis of a case like DeFunis v. _____, or the Adams-Richardson*/ case or the Higher Education Amendments of 1972 or earlier legislation concerning education in this country. And the third objective is ambitious, and white folks don't believe we can do it but I feel very strongly about it, and that is to develop new models for explicating the higher educational enterprise without succumbing to the hegemony of economic and mathematical models. We are going to ask different questions. We are already in touch with certain research centers which are sending out questionnaires and so forth, and the government. We are trying to feed in different questions from those that they've been asking in the past. I see these three broad objectives as, with important modifications, translatable into an outline for establishing an institute or center for the study of elementary and secondary educational policy. One final point. I personally feel, in terms of my own research, that a considerable amount of attention needs to be given to epistemology. At lunch I talked about my work on structuralism in trying to see what structuralism has to tell us about learning. It seems to me that Levi-Strauss conclusively destroys the claims of Jensen and Herrnstein and others who question the native intelligence of any people. Levi-Strauss even speaks to the question of motivation. His research indicates that people learn what they have an interest in learning, what they need to learn in order to get along in whatever context they are in. I think that it is amazing that we were talking about the cultural context of education without much explicit discussion of culture. And this is the reason why I alluded to Levi-Strauss. We are claiming in the Institute that we have a psycho-social and cultural perspective for the analysis of the educational enterprise, and I think that an institute that has a significant number of black scholars and intellectuals

---

*Footnote

in it can bring humanistic, cultural, psycho-social perspective to the analysis of educational problems. We have been victims of mathematical and economic models. These models tell us the cost and number of everything and the value and meaning of nothing.

Geneva Smitherman: I was just flashing on something when he was talking about us not being gods and dictating to the community. Beverlee talked about the colonized mentality. If Third World persons are not to replicate the negative social experiment of so-called democratically organized America, we are going to have to take leadership positions in our own community and talk about what a moral human being is and what an ideal human being is and what education is in terms of creating that kind of person. I understand that we can't be dictating to the community, but some of the voices that you hear from the community are calling for the same old models. They're subscribing to the same kinds of models which have been dehumanizing and destructive to them. It's up to educators who are setting policy and who have some humanistic perspectives themselves to take the leadership in redefining for their own communities as well as for the American community at large, what an ideal image of people would be.

Beverlee Bruce: I was going to say I think that some of us have become very self-conscious about the access we have had to knowledge that others of our community haven't, and because we have, we identify with the majority community which has as though we share the same ideology. In so doing, we allow this unnatural but certainly socially reinforced division between ourselves and our people. We too are members of the community. And I think it is a mistake, in a sense, to glorify certain aspects of the community without understanding the relationship between all of its members. For instance, the craze of glorifying the Super-Fly's, the prostitutes, and the pimps is fine if you realize that that is one segment of the community. I have a friend who went to see

Sweetback and she said, "It was a great movie." And I said, "Why?" I didn't see it so I couldn't get involved in the controversy. But she said, "Well, it was about people you know." Well, I said, "What kind of people?" She said, "Pimps and prostitutes." And I said, "Well, how many do you know?" She doesn't know any, but she has been socialized to believe that those are her friends. I'm not saying there's anything wrong with that; I don't want you to misunderstand. But I think we really need to look at what is going on.

I think there's a lot of ambivalence in our community. On the one hand, people look to education as a solution. On the other hand, they look to people who have been involved in the educational process as traitors or whatever. And part of what I think has to happen is what I think Ralph Ellison has called upon us to do, and that is to look at what in fact are the strengths of Afro-American cultures, what are the weaknesses, and to deal with those in a scientific manner. I think this is important. I have a friend who is a principal of a high school in Los Angeles and again he is part of the whole colonial mentality. He was the first black principal. He was the principal because black people in that community said, "We ain't going to have no more white principals." He was qualified but he would not have been elected to that position if it had not been for the community. He is making $30,000 a year, which is more than he has ever made in his life, and the superintendent of schools continually reminds him of that, but he feels that the constituency to which he owes his allegiance is the school board, and not the community. If it hadn't been for the community he would not have his job. He asked me once very confidentially, "Do you think that Jensen is in fact right?" Now that's very significant when a man is running a high school with three thousand black kids and three hundred teachers. Not only that, he once informed me of someone who applied for a job in a clerical position and the person didn't speak English. Well, being in the Boston area, I thought maybe this person was a French-speaking black or

a Spanish-speaking black. It was an Afro-American English-speaking black, and now three thousand students probably speak that language, but he didn't hire her because she didn't speak English, and he hired someone who did speak English who did a very lousy job in her position. Another situation in this same school, he took a classroom teacher and put him into an administrative position, and the person could not do the administrative functions. So I asked him, "What were the behavioral characteristics of this individual which made you think that he was of an administrative type?" and his answer was that he spoke and wrote standard English adequately. Now I think it's very important for black social scientists to begin to understand and make clear to people why he thinks that. Because on one level, his mother and father speak Afro-American English, but on another level, when he sees that his allegiance is to the school board and to the school committee, he denies the reality of that kind of cultural expression.

Marie Gadsden: At the risk of sounding very old, I'd like to suggest that some research be directed at the transforming elements of education for blacks before we had access to public education, particularly in states like the one that produced me, where there were a large number of schools that believed that the reason for education was transformation and not transmission. None of the schools which produced me has been written about. They were not public schools. They produced a lot of other people like me. There might be some very interesting data that you might get out of that. In short, I'm saying that for many of us, the idea of education as a transforming focus has always been the case. I would suggest that my twelve years in Africa and my residency in five countries in Africa establishes the same thing. That for a large segment of populations, which gives us our heritage, education has essentially been one of transformation and not one of transmission. Or at least it's been of transformation and transmission. Second, I have a sense of urgency that tells me we don't have a lot

of time to do a lot more experimentation. We've got to do something more than experiment. I think we have our last opportunity to do like our friend from Oregon. I would like to urge us to decide that we do something that gives us the chance to deal with ourselves as the entities that must make the change and stop looking to an alter area for the money, the manpower, the creativity, or whatever it takes to make that change. Nobody else is going to change it for us, and if we don't deal with what we have, pragmatically, among ourselves and within ourselves, you can forget it. At the risk of seeming negative and frustrated, I think if we don't survive we deserve not to.

Fred Erickson: As somebody trained in anthropology, I was taught a kind of cultural determinism that turns out to be sometimes as much of a trap as any kind of psycho-social determinism. I think one of the things such an institute might want to study would be people's lives from a wholeset of backgrounds in this society, who somehow have been able to manage both where they came from and what they got transformed into; the people who defy our expectations in terms of all the background variables we could find out about them. And I would include in that population not only people who made it in private school in the South, or people on reservations, Native Americans who have learned to deal successfully in other worlds, but people from the elite who have managed somehow by some set of accidents to work out of where they were coming from. And middle Americans who have managed to get out of either the disadvantages of their cultural difference or the tremendous guilt that they have, the Italian-Americans, the Polish-Americans, my Swedish-American relatives, about not being English. I think we need to find out what those kinds of people are like and what were the kinds of community conditions that seem to make that possible.

Sara Lightfoot: I think it's important that we recognize the differences among minority children, and take seriously individuality and not make gener-

alizations that are based on stereotypic notions of the way things are, that are fashioned by other people than us. Second, we must recognize differences in competencies and abilities among ourselves so that not everyone is expected to be a policy maker, a politician, a social reformer, and not everyone has to be a researcher. Our combined task is to do very careful disciplined scholarly research and to be social activists as well. It's important that researchers begin to conceptualize their questions with the idea of what evidence might mean in terms of translation into policy, which does not mean that they would necessarily always conceptualize the research questions with the practical in mind. But somehow there has to be a relationship to social context in research; I think that is very important. We have to begin to define education if we're really going to change it much beyond the context of schools. That doesn't mean deschooling society. That really means to me that we have to think of other institutions as educational institutions. No one today has mentioned the family, for instance, as a very important educational institution, and parents as primary teachers. No one has talked about the church or other ways in which we can think of education and in fact where education now goes on. We might look at that carefully, and look at the intersection between families and the schools.

Jacquelyne Jackson: This presentation has suggested to me anew the need for much greater specificity of subgroups within the racial, ethnic groups as well as across those lines who are affected by various educational systems. We cannot begin to discuss in general terms as we have attempted in some measure to do here, how and why the educational system is not working, because it is working for some minorities and for some black people and not for others. We need to have much more information about that. The question of federal control of education is very important to me, and that didn't come up. I think that we need to begin to talk about more federal policies with respect to

education as opposed to community type control, because one of the great problems with desegregation and compensatory education is in fact that under the Johnson administration Project Head Start was brought in as a way to cop out on desegregation. It was brought in for compensatory education to make some good cases in a sort of very functional purpose in that way. We see that now with much of the legislation taking place. Until we think about federal control of education and bringing about desegregated education so we can move to integrated education, this country will not have done much.

Gloria Primm: I think that until there is more education for parenting, until parents become more politicized and more aware of how policy is determined and aware of function, we're not going to really go anywhere. We have to know what they want. When they define their goals and objectives, we can begin to exert pressure on those people who are in the policy making positions, and this goes from the school superintendents and the teachers and what-not on up into the government. I think this is where it has to begin. People ought to be allowed to have a choice, ought to be allowed to define what their school system should be.

Bill Greenbaum: One possible function for the institute might be to think of ways to disseminate information and oversee new legislation, comment on it, censor it, whatever it is, with regard to its effect on people's choices in these matters, choices about self-determination and whether it's the taking over a school or an entire community. There's a point down the line where I don't think this is a microcosm of the society. I think this is a group of relatively close interests compared to the society, and yet there are so many differences within it, which is an even more fundamental problem but also a promise, because people have things that they're working on and care about. My sense of the need in the process of educating is that it will come to a point where, say, and institute would have to decide whether it was to facilitate

any choice or whether it prefers some choices. The first step in giving people choice is having some viable options, and that's why I endorse the support of places that seem to be working or that could work, where there is a great deal of control, where there's a great deal of cultural context. Where the cultural context is so strong, there is no question about how to train a teacher. If there can be some viable options, then people can have a clear sense of choice about whether or not they can move in that direction or into the mainstream as we've known it. The institute itself at some point might want to say, we will provide some kind of information on what the available choices are, and ways to make them. And then say, and we will give further services, at some point, to people who are actually moving in a particular direction. Other institutions will help people who are moving into the more mainstream, the more middle class direction.

Fritz Mosher: I liked what was said earlier about visions. I guess I have a preference for fairly concrete visions. I think it is useful to hold up fairly concrete goals, or to look at fairly real alternatives, so that you can ask whether you want that or not. I hope the center does work on real technical assistance. I think it would be very sad if it dealt only with rhetoric.

Stanley Sue: Maybe we've been too harsh on psychology. Maybe psychology has oversold itself and we expect too much. But psychology is nothing magical and it has probably failed in the same way that anthropologists or political scientists or educators have. Nevertheless, I think at this point, it might be very valuable to do research on how to translate our knowledge into action. And this would of course involve how to effect change. I think that learning how to get to politicians would be a very fruitful and practical area of research.

Warren Haymon: It seems to me that a center or an institution must first establish some basic premises. And I think if we're going to deal with education we must begin to talk about some humanistic values in an educational system.

A center must begin to redefine those because it's very obvious that if others define them for you they will continue to control you. I'd also point out that the community in fact is a laboratory and not Appian Way, and that it's there that we must begin to define the problems and the solutions. Rather than imposing these solutions on the community, however, we must say, "These are the consequences that you can expect of the actions that you take," and then let them decide which direction they want to go. It seems to me very important that when we talk about changing education, we move down to pre-school through age eight, and begin to focus our attention there, if we're really concerned about change. And when we talk about the socialization process, we should begin with the unborn, for significant change is made when we begin to deal with youngsters, pre-school through age eight. Furthermore, we must differentiate between process and model. A model is fixed, and we often begin to believe that once we create the model, that model will work for everybody at every given time. But a process is flexible and if we learn to use processes, we will be flexible in our deliberation. In terms of change in education, we must first understand the dilemma. When you change oil in a car, you stop the car, you let all the oil out, you put new oil in. We can't stop the educational process and make the necessary changes. First, the process is continuous, and second, we couldn't afford to just stop and make the changes that are needed. The nature of the change process itself, it seems to me, follows the logical pattern of awareness, commitment, and implementation. I look at it within the context of how it relates to me. One of the important things that I got out of Pedagogy of the Oppressed was this: when we change our role, let's make sure that as we change from being the oppressed, we don't assume the role that the oppressor has assumed for such a long time over us.

Gwen Baker: My first remark is that I hope the pie we've all been referring to will be seen in a cultural context, a multi-cultural context rather than

a black-white kind of pie. And that as we look at that pie we see cultures contributing and sharing, rather than asking who's going to get a piece of it. Transformation or transmission of culture -- I don't think there's a choice. We need both, but I think they too have to be within a multi-cultural context. I think we need to combine our efforts to rid ourselves of compensatory programs such as Head Start which are ethnocentric and racist and do nothing but to continue to perpetuate the transmission of a single culture. Alternative schools of course is one solution, but it's a choice that's limited to a few. And public education has a responsibility to respond and I think we have the responsibility to make it respond to the needs of our children. And last of all, because I am a teacher trainer, I can't help but emphasize the need for demanding that our teacher training institutions produce teachers who will be sensitive to develop and maintain accurate perceptions of cultural groups so that the motivation that Sara talked about earlier will indeed be there in terms of academic achievement and social behavior.

Jan Carew: The finest institute for race relations in the world exists in Johannesburg, South Africa. They do marvelous research. If you want to read papers on race relations, they put out the best papers on this. Its applicability to the society outside is non-existent. It has not by one iota changed the South African fascist state. And the scholarship continues doing research. We do not want to duplicate that by going into ebony towers to sit down endlessly carrying out research and researching ourselves to death. One of the factors that we have got to deal with, I think, which should be taken into account when one is thinking of this question of research, is that the whole of this society and the democratic society and the systems under which you are functioning are predicated on talking. You talk to someone, you give your ideas to someone. The psychologists who have been coming under attack at least have the advantage that somebody talks back to them, and the educational process seldom allows for

this. When we are talking about communities, we are talking then, if we are carrying out the educational experiments with those communities talking back to us, and it must not be talking back like that unholy marriage when the wife said to the husband, "From now on you take all the major decisions and I'll take all the minor ones, but I'll decide which is major and which minor." This again has the built-in dishonesties of scholarship that we have got to go into that community and we are really going to listen to that community, but we'll decide finally what is the major and what is the minor issue to give back to the community.

Mike Hall (? - Bill Hall, or Mike Cole): I'd like to thank you for coming and listening to what we had to say and talking back to us.